

REMARKS

Claims 1-100 are pending. Claims 1-100 are rejected. Claims 1 and 21 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

35 U.S.C. §102 Rejection

Claims 1-10, 12-16, 18-21, 24, 25, 27, 28, 30, 31, 34, 35, 37-48, 50-57, and 95-98 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Sedlar (U.S. Patent No. 6,549,916). Applicant have reviewed the above cited reference and respectfully submits that the present invention as recited in Claims 1-100, is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by the Sedlar reference.

Independent Claim 1

Applicant respectfully points out that independent Claim 1 recites that the present invention includes, in part:

A method for enhancing communication within a community, the method comprising:

\* \* \*

(e) presenting to at least a one of said plurality of users through said at least one of a plurality of input devices a selected portion of said communications stored in said hierarchical structure, wherein said selected portion of said communications are related under a topic; and

(f) enabling dynamic interaction through further contributions of communications by said at least a one of said plurality of users through said at least one of a plurality of input devices

in response to said selected portion of said communications within said hierarchical structure, wherein said further contributions of communications are stored and accessed within said hierarchical structure in relation to said topic.

The present invention pertains to a method of enhancing communication in which users, content, and documents are linked to form a user defined and growing body of knowledge. In particular, independent Claim 1 recites that a hierarchical structure is established for organizing communications between a plurality of users. Control of the hierarchical structure is distributed through selection of inherited parameters. The inherited parameters comprise parameters that define access by users to the communications organized within the hierarchical structure. A selected portion of communications is presented to a user that is related under a topic. Thereafter, dynamic interaction with the selection portion of communications is enabled by allowing further contributions of communications by the user that are stored and accessed within the hierarchical structure in relation to the topic.

Applicants respectfully note that the prior art reference, Sedlar, does not teach nor suggest the present method of enhancing communications that comprises, in particular, the dynamic interaction with a selected portion of communications related under a topic in which further contributions of communications are stored and accessed

within the hierarchical structure in relation to the topic, as claimed in independent Claim 1 of the present invention.

In contrast to independent Claim 1 of the present invention, the Sedlar reference discloses an event notification system in which an association is established between a type of file system operation, a file, and an interested entity. In response to detecting that the file system operation is performed on the file, a message or notification is sent to the interested entity.

In particular, the Sedlar reference does not teach the distribution of control of the hierarchical structure through the selection of inherited parameters to a user, as recited in independent Claim 1 of the present invention. The Sedlar reference teaches that the file system has directories arranged in hierarchy, in which the hierarchical relationships between the directories reflect some intuitive relationship between meanings assigned to the directories. (See col. 1, line 58 to col. 2, line 12 of the Sedlar reference). However, the Sedlar reference does not teach that control of the hierarchical structure is distributed to a user, and effected through selection of inherited parameters, as is recited in independent Claim 1. In addition, the Sedlar reference does not teach that control over the hierarchical structure is established through inherited parameters that define, in part, access by users

to the communications organized within the hierarchical structure.

In addition, the Sedlar reference does not teach the storing and presentation of communications in relation to a plurality of topics, as recited in independent Claim 1 of the present invention. In particular, the Sedlar reference does not teach the presentation of a selected portion of communications stored in the hierarchical structure, wherein the selected portion of the communication are related under a topic. The Sedlar reference teaches a file hierarchy in which files are selected that satisfy a query. (See col. 23, lines 34-47 of the Sedlar reference). However, the Sedlar reference does not specifically teach the presentation of a selected portion of the communications that are related under a topic, as is recited in independent Claim 1. That is, in embodiments of the present invention, a user is presented with communications under a particular topic for purposes of extending knowledge on that topic within a community.

Moreover, the Sedlar reference does not teach dynamic interaction by a user in response to the presentation of selected portions of communications to the user, as recited in independent Claim 1 of the present invention. The Sedlar reference teaches various means for implementing an event notification system in response to file system operations.

In particular, the Sedlar reference teaches that multiple copies of a document can be updated using the event notification system described in Sedlar when a file is updated. Also, the Sedlar reference teaches that in response to storing a document in a file, a message can be generated that notifies a user that the document is ready for review. (See col. 27. line 11 - col. 28, line 20 of the Sedlar reference). However, the Sedlar reference does not teach the enablement of dynamic interaction through further contributions of communications by a user in response to the presentation of selected portions of communications, wherein the further contributions of communications are stored and accessed within the hierarchical structure in relation to the topic, as is recited in independent Claim 1 of the present invention. That is, in embodiments of the present invention, further contributions of communications to a particular topic can be made in response to the presentation of selected portions of communications.

Thus, Applicant respectfully submit that the present invention as disclosed in independent Claim 1 is not anticipated by the Sedlar reference, and is in a condition for allowance. In addition, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 2-20 which depend from independent Claim 1 are also in a condition for allowance as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

### Independent Claim 21

Claims 21, 28, 30, 31, and 34 are of the same scope as Claims 1-3, 16, and 20, and are rejected for the same reason as for claims 1-3, 16, and 20. Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections for Claims 21, 28, 30, 31, and 34 are improperly addressed. (See M.P.E.P 707.07(d) and 706.02(j)). Specifically, Applicant requests that the basis for rejections for Claims 21, 28, 30, 31, and 34 be properly communicated to the Applicants so that the Applicant can identify the issues and respond in a fair manner. That is, if Claims 21, 28, 30, and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e), Applicants respectfully request clarification as to which arguments to which claims are relied upon to render the recited embodiments anticipated.

In the present case, it is unclear to which arguments from which of the referenced claims 1-3, 16, and 20 are applied to the rejected Claims 21, 28, 30, 31, and 34. That is, Applicant does not know whether to apply the referenced Claims 1-3, 16, and 20 singly, in groups, or as a whole, to each of the rejected Claims 1-3, 16, and 20.

However, even if the rejection of the claims is improper, for purposes of responding to the Office Action, Applicant makes the assumption that a one to one relationship is being asserted between rejected Claims 21, 28, 30, 31, and 34, and referenced Claims 1-3, 16, and 20.

In particular, Applicant makes the assumption that independent Claim 21 is of the same scope of independent Claim 1, and is rejected for similar reasons set forth in the rejection for independent Claim 1.

As such, Applicants respectfully assert that the present invention as recited in Claims 21, 28, 30, 31, and 34 is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by the Sedlar reference. Applicant respectfully points out that independent Claim 21 recites that the present invention includes, in part:

A computer system for enhancing communication within a community, the computer system comprising:

an application platform running an application that organizes a plurality of communications, said application further comprising:

\* \* \*

an inherited parameters responsibility module for establishing a hierarchical structure for said plurality of communications and for distributing control of said hierarchical structure to a plurality of users within the community, through selection of inherited parameters comprising parameters defining access by said plurality of users to said plurality of communications organized within said hierarchical structure;

\* \* \*

a reviewing module for presenting said synchronized plurality of communications in said hierarchical structure to said plurality of users for dynamic interaction enabled through further contributions of communications by said plurality of users, wherein said further contributions of communications are stored and accessed within



said hierarchical structure . . . (Emphasis Added)

The present invention pertains to a computer system that includes an application platform that is capable of enhancing communication in which users, content, and documents are linked to form a user defined and growing body of knowledge. In particular, independent Claim 21 recites that an inherited parameters responsibility module establishes a hierarchical structure for storing communications. Control of the hierarchical structure is enabled through selection of inherited parameters. Additionally, independent Claim 21 recites that a reviewing module presents a plurality of communications to users for dynamic interaction that is enabled through further contributions of communications by the plurality of users, wherein the further contributions are stored and accessed within the hierarchical structure.

In particular, Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 21, 28, 30, 31, and 34 is not of the same scope as referenced Claims 1-3, 16, and 20. That is, the computer system for enhancing communication within a community recited in independent Claim 21, is not of the same scope as the method recited in independent Claim 1 of the present invention. Specifically, the thread synchronization module, and output modules as recited in independent Claim 21 is not recited or described in any of the referenced Claims 1-3,



16, and 20. As such, at the very least, the rejection of independent Claim 21 is improper since none of the reference Claims 1-3, 16, and 20 are of the same scope, and therefore their rejections are improperly applied to independent Claim 21.

Moreover, for analogous reasons set forth in support of the arguments for the allowability of independent Claim 1, Applicants respectfully note that the Sedlar reference does not teach nor suggest the present computer system including an application platform that is capable of enhancing communications that comprises, in particular, an inherited parameters responsibility module for distributing control of the hierarchical structure to uses through selection of inherited parameters that define access to communications within the hierarchical structure, as is recited in independent Claim 21 of the present invention. In addition, the Sedlar reference does not teach the dynamic interaction with synchronized plurality of communications in which further contributions of communications by users are stored and accessed within the hierarchical structure, as claimed in independent Claim 21 of the present invention.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that the present invention as disclosed in independent Claim 21 is not anticipated by the Sedlar reference, and is in a condition for allowance. In addition, Applicants respectfully submit

that Claims 22-34 which depend from independent Claim 21 are also in a condition for allowance as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

#### Independent Claims 35 and 48

Claims 35, 37-48, and 50-57 are of the same scope as Claims 1-5, 9, 14-15, 18-20, and 24, and are rejected for the same reason as for Claims 1-5, 9, 14, 15, 18-20, and 24. Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections for Claims 35, 37-48, and 50-57 are improperly addressed. (See M.P.E.P 707.07(d) and 706.02(j)). Specifically, Applicant requests that the basis for rejections for Claims 35, 37-48, and 50-57 be properly communicated to the Applicants so that the Applicant can identify the issues and respond in a fair manner. That is, if Claims 35, 37-48, and 50-57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e), Applicants respectfully request clarification as to which arguments to which claims are relied upon to render the recited embodiments anticipated.

In the present case, it is unclear as to which arguments from which of the referenced claims 1-5, 9, 14-15, 18-20 and 24 are applied to the rejected Claims 35, 37-48, and 50-57. However, even if the rejection of the claims is improper, for purposes of responding to the Office Action, Applicant makes the assumption that a one-to-one relationship is being asserted. In particular, Applicant

makes the assumption that it is argued that independent Claim 35 is of the same scope of independent Claim 1, and is rejected for similar reasons set forth in the rejection for independent Claim 1. Also, Applicant makes the assumption that it is argued that independent Claim 48 is of the same scope of independent Claim 1, and is rejected for similar reasons set forth in the rejection for independent Claim 1.

As such, Applicants respectfully assert that the present invention as recited in Claims 35, 37-48, and 50-57 is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by the Sedlar reference.

Applicant respectfully points out that the present invention as recited in independent Claim 35 includes, in part:

A method for enhancing communication within a community, the method comprising the steps of:

\* \* \*

(e) determining a dynamic interaction capability for said user with said portion of said information based on said database hierarchy, said authorization parameters, and said interaction control parameters;

(f) prioritizing an order of said portion of said information;

(g) presenting said ordered said portion of said information to said user for review;

(h) accepting an initial input from said user according to said dynamic interaction capability from said first communication device for storage in said database; and

(i) outputting said initial input from said user to at least a second communication device.

Also, Applicant respectfully points out that the present invention as recited in independent Claim 48 includes, in part:

A method for enhancing communication within a community, the method comprising the steps of:

\* \* \*

(e) determining a dynamic interaction capability for said user with said portion of said information based on said database hierarchy, said authorization parameters, and said interaction control parameters;

(f) prioritizing an order of said portion of said information;

(g) presenting said ordered said portion of said information to said user for review;

(h) receiving a selection input by said user an item type to respond to;

(i) accepting a response input from said user according to said dynamic interaction capability from said first communication device for storage in said database; and

(j) outputting said response input from said user to at least a second communication device.

The present invention pertains to a method of enhancing communication that in which users, content, and documents are linked to form a user defined and growing body of knowledge. In particular, independent Claim 35 recites that a dynamic interaction is determined for a user with a portion of information based on database hierarchy, authorization parameters, and interaction control parameters. Thereafter, an initial input from the user is accepted according to the dynamic interaction capability for storage in the database.

In particular, Applicant respectfully asserts that Claims 35, 37-48, and 50-57 are not of the same scope as referenced Claims 1-5, 9, 14, 15, 18-20, and 24. That is, the method for enhancing communication as recited in independent Claim 35, is not of the same scope as the method recited in independent Claim 1. Specifically, the operation including "accepting an initial input" according to the dynamic interaction capability, and outputting the initial input of independent Claim 35 are not recited in any of the referenced Claims 1-5, 9, 14-15, 18-20 and 24. In addition, the operation including "accepting a response input" according to the dynamic interaction capability and outputting the response input of independent Claim 48 are not recited in any of the referenced Claim 1-5, 9, 14-15, 18-20, and 24. As such, the rejection of independent Claims 35 and 48 are improper since none of the referenced Claims 1-5, 9, 14-15, 18-20 and 24 are of the same scope, and therefore their rejections are improperly applied to independent Claims 35 and 48.

Moreover, for analogous reasons set forth in support of the arguments for the allowability of independent Claim 1, Applicants respectfully note that the Sedlar reference does not teach nor suggest the present method that is capable of determining a dynamic interaction capability for the user in relation to a portion of the information based on database hierarchy, authorization parameters, and interaction control

parameters. Specifically, the Sedlar reference does not teach a dynamic interaction that includes accepting an initial input from the user and the output of the initial input to a second device, as is recited in independent Claim 35 of the present invention. Also, the Sedlar reference does not teach a dynamic interaction that includes accepting a response input from the user and the output of the response input to a second device, as is recited in independent Claim 48 of the present invention.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that the present invention as disclosed in independent Claims 35 and 48 are not anticipated by the Sedlar reference, and is in a condition for allowance. In addition, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 36-47 which depend from independent Claim 35 are also in a condition for allowance as being dependent on an allowable base claim. Also, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 49-57 which depend from indent Claim 48 are also in a condition for allowance as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

#### Independent Claim 96

Claims 95-98 are of the same scope as Claims 1 and 18-20, and are rejected for the same reasons as for claims 1 and 18-20. Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections for Claims 95-98 are improperly addressed. (See M.P.E.P 707.07(d) and 706.02(j)). Specifically, Applicant

requests that the basis for rejections for Claims 95-98 be properly communicated to the Applicants so that the Applicant can identify the issues and respond in a fair manner. That is, if Claims 95-98 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e), Applicants respectfully request clarification as to which arguments to which claims are relied upon to render the recited embodiments anticipated.

In the present case, it is unclear to which arguments from which of the referenced claims 1 and 18-20 are applied to the rejected Claims 95-98. That is, Applicant does not know whether to apply the referenced Claims 1 and 18-20 singly, in groups, or as a whole, to each of the rejected Claims 95-98.

However, even if the rejection of the exclaims is improper, for purposes of responding to the Office Action, Applicant makes the assumption that a one to one relationship is being asserted between rejected Claims 95-98 and referenced Claims 1 and 18-20. In particular, Applicant makes the assumption that independent Claim 96 is of the same scope of independent Claim 1, and is rejected for similar reasons set forth in the rejection for independent Claim 1.

As such, Applicants respectfully assert that the present invention as recited in Claims 95-98 is neither



anticipated nor rendered obvious by the Sedlar reference. Applicant respectfully points out that independent Claim 96 recites that the present invention includes, in part:

A method for enhancing communication within a community, the method comprising:

\* \* \*

(c) storing in said hierarchical structure at least a portion of said communications received from said plurality of users from at least one of a plurality of input devices in relation to at least one of a plurality of topics;

(d) prioritizing said at least a portion of said communications within said hierarchical structure;

(e) presenting to at least a one of said plurality of users through said at least one of a plurality of input devices a selected portion of said communications stored in said hierarchical structure, wherein said selected portion of said communications is related under a topic; and

(f) alerting said at least a one of said plurality of users to an activity relating to said topic occurring within the community,

wherein said activity is a one of a topic within said hierarchical structure, an item type within said hierarchical structure, a response from an individual user within the community, a response from any one of a member of a group of users within the community, a new posting from an individual user within the community, and a new posting from any one of a member of a group of users within the community. (Emphasis Added)

The present invention pertains to a method of enhancing communication in which users, content, and documents are linked to form a user defined and growing body of knowledge. In particular, independent Claim 96 recites that a portion of communications is stored in relation to a least one of a plurality of topics. Then, a selected portion of the communications is presented to a user, wherein the selected

portion is related under a topic. An alert is created when an activity relating to the topic occurs within the community.

In particular, Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 95-98 is not of the same scope as referenced Claims 1 and 18-20. That is, the method for enhancing communication within a community recited in independent Claim 96, is not of the same scope as the method recited in independent Claim 1 of the present invention. Specifically, the alerting of a user to an activity that is related to a topic occurring within the community is not recited or described in the context of independent Claims 1 and 18-20. As such, at the very least, the rejection of independent Claim 96 is improper since none of the reference Claims 1 and 18-20 are of the same scope, and therefore their rejections are improperly applied to independent Claim 96.

Moreover, for analogous reasons set forth in support of the arguments for the allowability of independent Claim 1, Applicants respectfully note that the Sedlar reference does not teach nor suggest the present method for distributing control through the selection of inherited parameters, in which the inherited parameters comprise parameters that define access by users to the communications organized within the hierarchical structure, as is recited in independent Claim 96 of the present invention. In addition,

the Sedlar reference does not teach the presentation of a selected portion of communications, wherein the selected portion is related under a topic, as recited in independent Claim 96 of the present invention. additionally, the Sedlar reference does not teach the alerting of a user to an activity occurring within a community, wherein the activity includes one of a topic, an item type, a response from an individual user, a response from a member of a group of users, a new posting from a user, and a new posting from a member of a group of users, as is recited in independent Claim 96 of the present invention.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that the present invention as disclosed in independent Claim 96 is not anticipated by the Sedlar reference, and is in a condition for allowance. In addition, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 97-100 which depend from independent Claim 96 are also in a condition for allowance as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

35 U.S.C. §103(a) Rejection

Claims 11, 36, and 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Sedlar, and further in view of Dennis et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,466,932). Claims 17 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable



in a condition for allowance as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

Claims 22,23, 26, 29, 32, and 33 depend from independent Claim 21, now allowable as argued above. Moreover, the prior art references cited against the above rejected Claims taken alone, or in combination, do not disclose nor suggest the applicant platform that is capable of enhanced communication that includes dynamic interaction in response to the selected portion of communications presented to a user, as is presently claimed in independent Claim 21. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 22, 23, 26, 29, 32, and 33 which depend from independent Claim 21 are also in a condition for allowance as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

Claim 36 depends from independent Claim 35, now allowable as argued above. Also, Claims 49 depends from independent Claim 48, now argued as allowable above. Also, Claims 99-100 depend from independent Claim 96, now allowable as argued above. Thus Applicant submits that Claims 36, 49, and 99-100 which depend from allowable claims are also in a condition for allowance as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

### Independent Claim 58

Claims 58-69 are of the same scope as referenced Claims 1-5, 9, 11, 14-15, 24, 27, and 32-33 and are rejected for the same reasons as for the referenced claims. Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections for Claims 58-69 are improperly addressed. (See M.P.E.P 707.07(d) and 706.02(j)). Specifically, Applicant requests that the basis for rejections for Claims 58-69 be properly communicated to the Applicants so that the Applicant can identify the issues and respond in a fair manner. In particular, Applicant respectfully requests the relevant teachings of the prior art relied upon, and an explanation why one of ordinary skill would be motivated to combine the teachings. That is, if Claims 58-69 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), Applicants respectfully request clarification as to which arguments to which claims are relied upon to render the recited embodiments anticipated.

In the present case, it is unclear to which arguments from which of the referenced claims 1-5, 9, 11, 14, 15, 24, 27, and 32-33, are applied to the rejected Claims 58-69. That is, Applicant does not know whether to apply the referenced Claims singly, in groups, or as a whole, to each of the rejected Claims 58-69. In addition, it is unclear to Applicant whether the rejections are presented under a 102 or 103 argument, since the referenced Claims encompass both 102 and 103 rejections. Further, it is unclear to Applicant

whether the rejections are presented under a 102 or 103 argument, since the referenced independent Claim 1 is rejected under a 102 argument, but Applicant understands that independent Claim 58 is rejected under a 103 argument.

However, even if the rejection of claims 58-69 are improper, for purposes of responding to the Office Action, Applicant makes the assumption that a one to one relationship is being asserted between rejected Claims 58-69 and the referenced Claims. In particular, Applicant makes the assumption that independent Claim 58 is of the same scope of independent Claim 1, and is rejected for similar reasons, set forth in the rejection for independent Claim 1 and the corresponding claim. As such, Applicant respectfully asserts that the present invention as recited in Claims 58-69 is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by the Sedlar reference.

The present invention pertains to a method of enhancing communication in which users, content, and documents are linked to form a user defined and growing body of knowledge. In particular, independent Claim 58 recites that a request is received to customize reviewable content by creating a digital binder, and that a selection input from the user is included in the digital binder, which thereafter is presented for review to the user. In addition, a dynamic interaction capability is determined for the user in



relation to the portion of the information stored in the database.

In particular, Applicants respectfully assert that independent Claim 58 is not of the same scope as the referenced Claims. That is, the method for enhancing communication within a community recited in independent Claim 58, is not of the same scope as the method recited in independent Claim 1 of the present invention. Specifically, the creation of the digital binder, the receiving of a part of a portion of the information for inclusion to the digital binder, and the presenting for review of the sorted part of the portion of the information in the digital binder is not recited or described in the context of independent Claim 1. As such, the rejection of independent Claim 58 is improper since the reference Claim 1 is not of the same scope, and therefore its rejection is improperly applied to independent Claim 58.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that the present invention as disclosed in independent Claim 58 is not anticipated by the Sedlar reference, and is in a condition for allowance. In addition, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 59-69 which depend from independent Claim 58 are also in a condition for allowance as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

### Independent Claim 70

Claims 70-80 are of the same scope as referenced Claims 1-5, 9, 11, 14-16, and 24 and are rejected for the same reasons as for the referenced claims. Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections for Claims 70-80 are improperly addressed. (See M.P.E.P 707.07(d) and 706.02(j)). Specifically, Applicant requests that the basis for rejections for Claims 70-80 be properly communicated to the Applicants so that the Applicant can identify the issues and respond in a fair manner. In particular, Applicant respectfully requests the relevant teachings of the prior art relied upon, and an explanation why one of ordinary skill would be motivated to combine the teachings. That is, if Claims 70-80 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), Applicants respectfully request clarification as to which arguments to which claims are relied upon to render the recited embodiments anticipated.

In the present case, it is unclear to which arguments from which of the referenced claims are applied to the rejected Claims 70-80. That is, Applicant does not know whether to apply the referenced Claims singly, in groups, or as a whole, to each of the rejected Claims 70-80. In addition, it is unclear to Applicant whether the rejections are presented under a 102 or 103 argument, since the referenced Claims encompass both 102 and 103 rejections. Further, it is unclear to Applicant whether the rejections

are presented under a 102 or 103 argument, since the referenced independent Claim 1 is rejected under a 102 argument, but Applicant understands that independent Claim 58 is rejected under a 103 argument.

However, even if the rejection of claims 70-80 are improper, for purposes of responding to the Office Action, Applicant makes the assumption that a one to one relationship is being asserted between rejected Claims 70-80 and the referenced Claims. In particular, Applicant makes the assumption that independent Claim 70 is of the same scope of independent Claim 1, and is rejected for similar reasons, set forth in the rejection for independent Claim 1 and the corresponding claim. As such, Applicant respectfully asserts that the present invention as recited in Claims 70-80 is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by the Sedlar reference.

The present invention pertains to a method of enhancing communication in which users, content, and documents are linked to form a user defined and growing body of knowledge. In particular, independent Claim 70 recites that an ordered portion of information is presented to the user for review. Selection input is accepted from the user for an output, and the output is presented to a second device.

In particular, Applicants respectfully assert that independent Claim 70 is not of the same scope as the referenced claims. That is, the method for enhancing communication within a community recited in independent Claim 70, is not of the same scope as the method recited in independent Claim 1 of the present invention. Specifically, the creation of the selection input as an output to a second communication device is not recited or described in the context of independent Claim 1. As such, the rejection of independent Claim 70 is improper since the reference Claim 1 is not of the same scope, and therefore its rejection is improperly applied to independent Claim 70.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that the present invention as disclosed in independent Claim 70 is not anticipated by the Sedlar reference, and is in a condition for allowance. In addition, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 71-80 which depend from independent Claim 70 are also in a condition for allowance as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

#### Independent Claim 81

Claims 81-95 are of the same scope as referenced Claims 1-3, 16, 17, 20, 22-27, and 32-33, and are rejected for the same reasons as for the referenced claims. Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections for Claims 81-95 are improperly addressed. (See M.P.E.P 707.07(d) and

706.02(j)). Specifically, Applicant requests that the basis for rejections for Claims 81-95 be properly communicated to the Applicants so that the Applicant can identify the issues and respond in a fair manner. In particular, Applicant respectfully requests the relevant teachings of the prior art relied upon, and an explanation why one of ordinary skill would be motivated to combine the teachings. That is, if Claims 81-95 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), Applicants respectfully request clarification as to which arguments to which claims are relied upon to render the recited embodiments anticipated.

In the present case, it is unclear to which arguments from which of the referenced claims are applied to the rejected Claims 81-95. That is, Applicant does not know whether to apply the referenced Claims singly, in groups, or as a whole, to each of the rejected Claims 81-95. In addition, it is unclear to Applicant whether the rejections are presented under a 102 or 103 argument, since the referenced Claims encompass both 102 and 103 rejections. Further, it is unclear to Applicant whether the rejections are presented under a 102 or 103 argument, since the referenced independent Claim 1 is rejected under a 102 argument, but Applicant understands that independent Claim 81 is rejected under a 103 argument.

However, even if the rejection of claims 81-95 is improper, for purposes of responding to the Office Action, Applicant makes the assumption that a one to one relationship is being asserted between rejected Claims 81-95 and the referenced Claims. In particular, Applicant makes the assumption that independent Claim 81 is of the same scope of independent Claim 1, and is rejected for similar reasons, set forth in the rejection for independent Claim 1 and the corresponding claim. As such, Applicant respectfully asserts that the present invention as recited in Claims 81-95 is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by the Sedlar reference.

The present invention pertains to a computer system including an application platform capable of enhancing communication in which users, content, and documents are linked to form a user defined and growing body of knowledge. In particular, independent Claim 81 recites that the platform includes a reviewing module for presenting ordered portion of information to a user, an input module for accepting input, a thread synchronization module for synchronizing the input with information stored in the database and an output module for outputting a response to a second communication device.

In particular, Applicant respectfully asserts that independent Claim 81 is not of the same scope as the referenced claims. That is, the applicant platform for enhancing communication recited in independent Claim 81, is not of the same scope as the method recited in independent Claim 1 of the present invention. Specifically, the reviewing module, the input module, the thread synchronization module, and the output module, is not recited or described in the context of independent Claim 1. As such, the rejection of independent Claim 81 is improper since the reference Claim 1 is not of the same scope, and therefore its rejection is improperly applied to independent Claim 81.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that the present invention as disclosed in independent Claim 81 is not anticipated by the Sedlar reference, and is in a condition for allowance. In addition, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 82-95 which depend from independent Claim 81 are also in a condition for allowance as being dependent on an allowable base claim.



CONCLUSION

In light of the amendments and arguments presented herein, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejected Claims for allowance thereof.


Based on the arguments presented above, Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 1-100 overcome the rejections of record. Therefore, Applicants respectfully solicit allowance of these Claims.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

Wagner, Murabito & Hao LLP

Date: 5 April 2006



Lin C. Hsu  
Reg. No.: 46,315  
Two North Market Street  
Third Floor  
San Jose, California 95113